

REMARKS

Applicant has carefully studied the outstanding Official Action. The present amendment is intended to be fully responsive to all points of rejection and is believed to place the application in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the present application are hereby respectfully requested.

The Examiner's indication that claims 5, 6, 8, 10, 16, 18 - 20 and 28 - 30 would be allowable if rewritten in proper independent form is gratefully acknowledged.

Claims 1 - 4, 7, 9, 11 - 15, 17, 21 - 27, 31 and 32 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 6,020,882 to Kinghorn et al.

Kinghorn et al describes an arrangement for the control of viewing of a television program in which a code is transmitted with the video signal. A decoder detects the received codes and passes them to a microcontroller. An authorized user is able to enter codes of permitted program classifications by means of a remote control unit. The received and permitted codes are compared in the microcontroller which inhibits the video and/or audio circuits if the received codes are not permitted codes. A non-volatile memory is arranged to store a plurality of different program classifications, each of which is valid for different periods of the day.

Applicant does not necessarily agree with the Examiner's rejection of claims 1 - 4, 7, 9, 11 - 15, 17, 21 - 27, 31 and 32. However, in order to facilitate allowance of the present application, claim 1 has been amended to recite the limitation of claim 5, which the Examiner indicated would be allowable if rewritten in proper independent form.

Claim 1 is therefore deemed allowable.

Claim 5 has been cancelled. Consequential amendments to the dependency of claims 6, 8 and 19 have been made.

Claims 2 - 4, 7, 9, 11 - 15, 17 and 21 depend either directly or indirectly from amended claim 1, and recite additional patentable material. Claims 2 - 4, 7, 9, 11 - 15, 17 and 21 are therefore deemed allowable.

In order to facilitate allowance of the present application, claim 22 has been amended to recite a limitation similar to that of claim 5, which the Examiner indicated would be allowable if rewritten in proper independent form. The amendment to claim 22 is supported, inter-alia, by the first full paragraph on page 13 of the application.

Claim 22 is therefore deemed allowable.

In order to facilitate allowance of the present application, claim 23 has been amended to recite the limitation of claim 28, which the Examiner indicated would be allowable if rewritten in proper independent form.

Claim 23 is therefore deemed allowable.

Claims 24 - 27 depend either directly or indirectly from amended claim 23, and recite additional patentable matter.

Claims 24 - 27 are therefore deemed allowable.

Claim 28 has been cancelled. A consequential amendment to the dependency of claim 29 has been made.

Claim 31 is an apparatus claim which corresponds to method claim 1 and has been similarly amended.

Amended claim 31 is therefore deemed allowable with reference to the discussion of the allowability of amended claim 1.

Claim 32 is an apparatus claim which corresponds to method claim 22 and has been similarly amended.

Amended claim 32 is therefore deemed allowable with reference to the discussion of the allowability of amended claim 22.

New claims 33 - 51 have been added.

New claim 33 comprises the recitation of claim 16 rewritten in independent form, which the Examiner indicated would be allowable. New claim 33 comprises the recitation of claim 16 including all of the limitations of base claim 1 and intervening claims 2 and 15.

New claim 33 is therefore deemed allowable.

Claim 16 has been cancelled.

New claims 34 - 50 correspond respectively to originally filed dependent claims 3 - 14 and 17 - 21. New claims 34 - 50 depend, either directly or indirectly, from new claim 33 and recite additional patentable subject matter.

New claims 34 - 50 are therefore deemed allowable.

New claim 51 is an apparatus claim that corresponds to new method claim 33. New claim 51 is therefore deemed allowable.

Applicant has carefully studied the other prior art of record including U.S. Patent 6,360,367 to Yamamoto; U.S. Patent 6,481,009 to Miyakoshi; and U.S. Patent 6,553,566 to Grant et al.

U.S. Patent 6,360,367 to Yamamoto describes a program-viewing inhibition device comprising a memory for storing inhibition level data indicative of a predetermined level of unsuitability rating of a broadcasting program, a control section for determining whether or not an input channel received is acceptable by comparing inhibition level data extracted from a broadcast signal of an received input channel with the inhibition level data read out of the memory, and for changing the input channel to another channel when it is judged that the input channel is unacceptable or to be rejected for viewing.

U.S. Patent 6,481,009 to Miyakoshi describes a television receiver which comprises a setting key to be manipulated for setting rating information, a decoder for extracting rating information from V-chip signal, a memory for storing rating information, and a control circuit for reading rating information from the decoder when the user depresses the setting key and storing the read rating information in the memory.

U.S. Patent 6,553,566 to Grant et al describes an apparatus and a method for manipulating video, audio, closed-captioned and compressed video packet data embedded in video programming signals includes a video signal processor for embedding data into a broadcast video signal prior to broadcast, the video signal containing at least one of video information, audio information, closed-captioned information and video packet data information. An instruction defining a predetermined screening format for at least one of the video information, the audio information, the closed-captioned information and the video

packet data information is stored and a circuit is responsive to the embedded data and the stored instruction for reproducing the information in the video signal in a predetermined screening format.

Applicant finds that the present invention as claimed is neither described nor suggested in the prior art of record, taken either individually or in combination.

In view of the foregoing remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is now in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the present application are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



JULIAN H. COHEN
LADAS & PARRY
26 WEST 61ST STREET
NEW YORK, NEW YORK 10023
REG. NO. 20302(212)708-1887